

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 CHARLES D. CUNNINGHAM,

12 Defendant/Judgment Debtor,

13 v.

14 KING COUNTY PAYROLL,

15 Garnishee.
16

Case No. MC16-0052RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
REDUCE GARNISHMENT AMOUNT

17 This matter comes before the Court on defendant/judgment debtor's letter requesting that
18 a smaller percentage of his pay be garnished as restitution. Dkt. # 14. The government opposes
19 the request, pointing out that financial hardship is not a valid objection to garnishment and that
20 the evidence provided does not support the alleged hardship. Dkt. # 15. Mr. Cunningham has not
21 filed a reply.

22 Mr. Cunningham has not asserted a viable objection or shown any hardship that could
23 overcome the government's interest in garnishment. After reviewing the papers submitted, the
24 request for a reduction is DENIED.

25 //
26

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
REDUCE GARNISHMENT AMOUNT

1 Dated this 31st day of March, 2020.

2 *Robert S. Lasnik*

3 Robert S. Lasnik

4 United States District Judge